


UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES



Ex parte THOMAS ANTHONY COFINO,
JUHNYOUNG LEE
and
MARK EDWARD PODLASECK

Application 10/620,407

ORDER RETURNING UNDOCKETED APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was received electronically at the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on November 15, 2006. A review of the application has revealed that the application is not ready for docketing as an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being electronically returned to the examiner. The matters requiring attention prior to docketing are identified below:

An examination of the Image File Wrapper (IFW) reveals that an Appeal Brief was filed on May 2, 2006.

37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(v) (2005) reads as follows:

(c)(1) The brief shall contain the following items under appropriate headings and in the order indicated in paragraphs (c)(1)(i) through (c)(1)(x) of this section, except that a brief filed by an appellant who is not represented by a registered practitioner need only substantially comply with paragraphs (c)(1)(i) through (c)(1)(iv) and (c)(1)(vii) through (c)(1)(x) of this section:

....

(v) *Summary of claimed subject matter.* A concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, which shall refer to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters. For each independent claim involved in the appeal and for each dependent claim argued separately under the provisions of paragraph (c)(1)(vii) of this section, every means plus function and step plus function as permitted by 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, must be identified and the structure, material, or acts described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function must be set forth with reference to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters.

The “Summary of claimed subject matter” appearing on pages 2-4 of the Appeal Brief filed May 2, 2006 is deficient because it does not map the independent claims to the specification. Correction is required.

In addition, an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) was filed on April 8, 2005. It is not apparent from the record whether the examiner considered the statement submitted or notified appellants regarding why their submission did not meet the criteria set forth in 37 CFR §§ 1.97 and

1.98. A communication notifying appellants of the Primary Examiner's decision is required.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the application is returned to the Examiner:

1) for notification to appellants to submit a substitute Appeal Brief which corrects the "Summary of Claimed Subject Matter";

2) for consideration of the substitute Appeal Brief;

3) for consideration of the IDS filed May 8, 2005, and written notification to appellants regarding the Primary Examiner's decision; and

4) for such further action as may be appropriate.

BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

By: Patrick J. Nolan
PATRICK J. NOLAN
Deputy Chief Appeals Administrator
(571) 272-9797

PJN:psb

Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road
Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824